





APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,211	10/23/2001	Amold W. Fogel	B30-050	2238
. 75	90 07/18/2003			
Henry D. Coleman Coleman Sudol Sapone, P.C. 714 Colorado Avenue			EXAMINER	
			HUI, SAN MING R	
Bridgeport, CT	00005-1001	•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1617	
			DATE MAILED: 07/18/2003	^

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/045,211	FOGEL, ARNOLD W.
ravicery rieden	Examiner	Art Unit
·	San-ming Hui	1617
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 17 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply to a not places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing a FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>17 June 2003</u> . App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR		
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•	•
Claim(s) allowed: None.		
Claim(s) objected to: None.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-36</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·
10. Other:	. Ti	HEODORE J. CRIARES PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1260/(0)
		

.....





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The instant claims are drawn to a composition comporising the emulsifier components. Applicant's rebtuttal arguments averring no motivation was provide to combine the herein claimed components have been considered, but are not found persuasive since the herein claimed agents are known to be useful as emulsifiers. It flows logically to combine these agents together into a single composition useful for the very same purpose, absenevidence to the contrary (See In re Kerkhoven 205 USPQ 1069).

Applicant's rebuttal arguments averring the superior stability of the herein claimed composition have been considered, but are not found persuasive. Examiner notes that it is applicant's burden to demonstrate unexpected benefit. In the instant case, no data was set forth in

the specification for demonstrating the unexpected result. Therefore, no unexpected results are seen herein.

Applicant's rebuttal arguments averring no motivation was provided in McCutcheon to select the herein claimed component, Arlacel 135 have been considered, but are not found persuasive. The teachings of McCutcheon teaches a list of cosmetic emulsifiers, therefore, on of ordinary skill in the art would consider the selection of Arlacel 135 as selecting the emulsifiers from the obvious alternatives, absent evidence to the contrary.

Examiner notes that Applicant does not respond to the rejection under 35 USC 112

No unanswered rebuttal arguments are seen to be present herein.